

# LIBERATION

AND OVER-HARVARD  
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY  
Mr. Osterman  
been close  
.921.

TIMES,

GE UP  
INT D

U.S.  
NOV

EL  
SAN

The proc  
ar. There  
ts most im  
remendous  
hat it is p  
with ex  
usual

only  
begin-  
limi-  
s. He  
7, and



Desp  
Mik

FEW

Prop:

Ru

H

By

The

last w

trac

Rus

N

tra

Fi

of

visi

ho

ma

He

s

that

quenc

The

in

trad

num

last

expos

Unit

dw

w R

igh-

Solv

our

conv

v Ro

with

ustri

hey

195

elop

ding

unu

y me

ch,

at

nt

oad.

he

the

trac

hells

Rus

N

tra

Fi

of

visi

ho

ma

He

s

that

100s. m

3

2

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

Le

21

35

50

65

80

95

110

125

140

155

170

185

200

215

230

245

260

275

290

305

320

335

350

365

380

395

410

425

440

455

470

485

50

60

70

80

90

100

110

120

130

140

150

160

170

180

190

200

210

220

230

240

250

260

270

280

290

300

310

320

330

340

350

360

370

380

390

400

410

420

430

440

450

460

470

480

490

500

510

520

530

540

550

560

570

580

590

600

610

620

630

640

650

660

670

680

690

700

710

720

730

740

750

760

770

780

790

800

810

820

830

840

850

860

870

880

890

900

910

920

930

940

950

960

970

980

990

1000

1010

1020

1030

1040

1050

1060

1070

1080

1090

1100

1110

1120

1130

1140

1150

1160

1170

1180

1190

1200

1210

1220

1230

1240

1250

1260

1270

1280

1290

1300

1310

1320

1330

1340

1350

1360

1370

1380

1390

1400

1410

1420

1430

1440

1450

1460

1470

1480

1490

1500

1510

1520

1530

1540

1550

1560

1570

1580

1590

1600

1610

1620

1630

1640

1650

1660

1670

1680

1690

1700

1710

1720

1730

1740

1750

1760

1770

1780

1790

1800

1810

1820

1830

1840

1850

1860

1870

1880

1890

1900

1910

1920

1930

1940

1950

1960

1970

1980

1990

2000

2010

2020

2030

# LIBERATION AN INDEPENDENT MONTHLY

110 Christopher St. New York 14, N. Y.

OHelsea 3-5411

Chicago: 4831 South Dorchester

England: care of Housmans, 3 Blackstock Road, London N4

## CONTENTS Vol. IV, No. 4

### Editorials

- A Secret Army for NATO*  
After the Beat Generation:  
*Hipsters Unleashed*  
*Protest of a 17-Year-Old*  
*Poet (a poem)*  
*Crackpot*  
*Prosody*  
*Note on the Religious*  
*Tendencies*  
*Poetry and Politics*  
*The Social Lie*  
*Mr. Rexroth's Gimmick*  
*Not So Long Ago (Part XVIII)*  
*Letters*  
*Ugly and Not So Innocent*

- 3  
5 Captain D. J. Goodspeed, RCA  
8 David McReynolds  
9 Charles Willoughby Smith  
10 Curtis Zahn  
10 Allen Ginsberg  
11 Gary Snyder  
12 Walter Lowenfels  
13 Lawrence Lipton  
13 Leslie Woolf Hedley  
15 A. J. Muste  
18  
19 Charles Chadwick

### In This Issue:

The quotations from "The Secret Army" are taken from an article with that title which originally appeared in the General Military Review for October 1957. The Review is published in France under the sponsorship of the leading military figures in NATO and its member countries.

The Editors asked a number of individuals to comment on the social roots, literary quality, political and religious emphases, and future implications of the beat generation. Some of the replies are printed on Pages 8 through 14.

DAVID McREYNOLDS is Editorial Secretary of LIBERATION and a contributor to the Village Voice in New York. CHARLES WILLOUGHBY SMITH lives in Chicago.

CURTIS ZAHN's "Retrospections of a Man Left of Center" appeared in the May 1958 LIBERATION.

ALLEN GINSBERG's "Europe! Europe!" and "To Aunt Rose" appeared in the April 1959 LIBERATION.

GARY SNYDER, who was one of the first poets to be identified with the beat generation, is now in a Zen Buddhist monastery in Japan.

WALTER LOWENFELS served a term in prison as a Smith Act victim, and is a well-known poet. His latest book, *Song of Peace*, can be obtained for \$1.35 (paper) or \$5.00 (cloth) from the Roving Eye Press, 37 W. 8th St., New York 11, N. Y.

"The Social Lie", an interview with Kenneth Rexroth, is reprinted by permission of Julian Messner, Inc. from the book, *The Holy Barbarians*.

KENNETH REXROTH is widely known as a poet, critic, translator, and an early participant in poetry-jazz sessions. He is currently living in France.

LESLIE WOOLF HEDLEY's latest book, *Zero Hour*, is available from Inferno Press, Box 5030, San Francisco, Calif. for \$2.00.

LIBERATION Editor BAYARD RUSTIN, who was co-ordinator of the recent Youth March for Integrated Schools, reports that more than five hundred LIBERATION readers returned signed petitions urging the President and Congress "to put into effect an executive and legislative program which will insure the orderly and speedy integration of schools throughout the United States."

In the next LIBERATION, which will be a double issue for July and August, Roy Finch, Jack Jones and Joseph Starobin will analyze the nature and some of the implications of "The Totalitarian Mind"; Harry Elmer Barnes will reply to four criticisms of his defense of historical Revisionism, which LIBERATION published a year ago and which has aroused considerable discussion here and abroad ever since; and Walter Wills will report on the recent harassment of the Catholic Worker group in New York by their new neighbors and the city authorities.

### EDITORIAL BOARD

Dave Dellinger  
Roy Finch  
Sidney Lens  
A. J. Muste  
Bayard Rustin

### ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Robert Pickus  
Mulford Sibley  
Charles Walker  
Denny Wilcher

### BUSINESS MANAGER

Ralph Di Gio

### EDITORIAL SECRETARY

David McReynolds

### CONTRIBUTORS

Claire Huchet Bishop  
Charles Bloomstein  
Don Calhoun  
Martin J. Corbin  
Dorothy Day  
Waldo Frank  
Richard Gregg  
Wallace Hamilton  
Michael Harrington  
William Hesselstine  
Homer A. Jack  
Paul Jacobs  
Herbert Kelman  
Roy Kepler  
Martin Luther King, Jr.  
Staughton Lynd  
Norman Mailer  
Milton Mayer  
Helen Mears  
Lewis Mumford  
Don Murray  
William Neumann  
Victor Paschke  
Kenneth Patchen  
James Peck  
Benjamin Reid  
Kenneth Rexroth  
Pitirim Sorokin  
Kurt H. Wolff  
Curtis Zahn  
Berlin  
Henry Holm  
Calcutta  
Nirmal Kumar Bose  
London  
Vera Brittain  
J. Allen Skinner  
New Delhi  
Krishnalal Shridharan  
Vancouver  
George Woodcock

### ARTIST

Rita Corbin

### PHOTOGRAPHER

Harold Feinstein

Printed by  
LIBERTARIAN PRESS  
a workers' community shop  
GLEN GARDNER, N. J.

Subscription: 1 year .. \$3.00; Individual Copies .. 80c  
Make checks and money orders payable to LIBERATION



## editorials

### THE TIMES REPLIES

Dear Mr. Muste: May 12, 1959  
Indeed I have seen the correspondence between you and Mr. Garst, and I have read the editorial in *LIBERATION* to which you called my attention.

I have only one comment to make and that is this: The basic charge in your editorial that the New York *Times* withheld information from the people "for the precise purpose of keeping them from expressing their opinions on a political question" is so far fetched as to be ridiculous.

At the time of publication of the story, the New York *Times* set forth in an open and frank manner the reasons why it held up the story as it did. We stand on those reasons.

Very truly yours,  
TURNER CATLEDGE  
Managing Editor  
The New York *Times*

The "reasons" given in the issue of the *Times* to which Mr. Catledge refers (March 19) include the following:

"The New York *Times* learned of plans for Project Argus last summer, some weeks before it took place. The information was obtained without limitation on its use. Nevertheless, scientists associated with the government said they feared that prior announcement of the experiment might lead to protests that would force its cancellation."

In addition, in the March-April issue of *Times Talk* (house organ of the *Times*), Walter Sullivan has this to say:

"Firing atomic bombs above the atmosphere and so far from our shores raised grave diplomatic problems. He [a key figure in the space program]

whom Sullivan consulted] said that, in his opinion, publication of the plan in advance might force cancellation of the experiment."

Mr. Sullivan also says, speaking of a later period:

"During this period [early January, 1959, when news of the explosions was becoming increasingly difficult to deny] I consulted with several scientists of the highest integrity.

Virtually all agreed that the only reason for withholding the story was political—to avoid embarrassment to the Government."

To give Sullivan credit, he continues by saying:

"This, I felt, was not enough to justify our sitting on it any longer."

However, it was approximately two months more before the *Times* finally broke the story. Information in Sullivan's article makes it clear that by this time several publications were hot on the story and that there was now danger that *Newsweek* would scoop the *Times*.

### Baldwin's Reaction

In addition to the letter from Mr. Catledge, we have received the following letter from Hanson Baldwin, military editor of the *Times*, who wrote the original lead story disclosing the tests:

Dear Mr. Muste: May 12, 1959  
I have your letter of May 8 with enclosures. The correspondence with Mr. Garst was new to me.

I cannot, of course, speak for Mr. Garst nor do I think that any additional comment is necessary. But I can speak for myself and I have no hesitancy in doing so. The responsibility for withholding the information was mine and mine alone. The editors of the *Times* knew nothing of the story until shortly before we published it. This decision was made by me after the most careful consideration. I have no hesitancy in saying that I believe I followed the right course and that I would do the same thing again.

You speak of conscience, of responsibility and of ideals. You have no monopoly on any of these. Freedom of the press means a great sense of responsibility to the good of the country and to the greatest good of the greatest number. Every newspaperman worth his salt faces the problem of whether or not to publish certain information and every newspaperman worth his salt does at some time or another withhold some

information. Freedom can never mean license. Nor can it mean the kind of naivete that you display. Your point of view, in my opinion, is the fuzzy, well intentioned but highly dangerous one which motivates far too many of our so-called Liberals. You are inaccurate in fact as well as in opinion. The Argus tests were of tremendous potential and actual military importance; the issue was not only political. Furthermore the question of fallout had virtually nothing to do with the issue; small-scale detonations at high altitude result in inconsequential fallout.

It is precisely because I feel and the *Times* feels a high sense of responsibility to the greatest good of the greatest number and a sense of responsibility to our country that the story was handled as it was. I repeat: you have no monopoly on conscience.

Sincerely yours,  
HANSON W. BALDWIN  
(Military Editor)  
The New York *Times*

Fortunately, no individual, group, or country has a monopoly on conscience—though America's foreign policy, to which Mr. Baldwin feels such an overweening sense of responsibility, seems to be based on the contrary assumption. But unfortunately a handful of news-gathering agencies do have a virtual monopoly on access to crucial information and on the financial resources necessary for its widespread public dissemination. In this case it is clear that three men on the *Times* (Baldwin, Sullivan and Edward Mossien, according to *Times Talk*) had access to important, unclassified information whose "publication . . . in advance might force cancellation of the experiment." They concealed this information from the public—apparently because they favored the continuation and extension of nuclear test explosions. Sullivan and Baldwin make clear that they feared that publication of "the year's biggest news beat" would provoke:

1. *Public protests* ("Prior announcement of the experiment might lead to protests that would force its cancellation"; Baldwin in the *Times*, March 19).

2. *Objections from foreign governments* ("Firing atomic bombs above the atmosphere and so far from our shores raised grave diplomatic problems"; Sullivan in *Times Talk*). "Last September the United States drew a thin curtain of radiation

May 14, 1959

Dear Mr. Muste: Washington, D. C.

Thank you for your letter of May 8, enclosing the May issue of *LIBERATION* telling of your exchange with the New York *Times* relative to Project Argus. I am very glad to have it.

As a matter of principle, I believe newspapers should try to avoid managing the news, no matter how lofty their intentions!

Sincerely yours,  
Clinton P. Anderson  
(U. S. Senator from New Mexico)  
Chairman, Joint Committee on  
Atomic Energy

around the earth. For a period whose duration is still secret it *enveloped almost the entire inhabited portion of the globe.*" [italics ours]; Sullivan in the *Times*, March 19. "It was feared that the Russians would exploit the fact that the United States had secretly fired nuclear weapons in a region far from its shores and far from its known atomic proving grounds"; Baldwin, *Times*, March 19.

3. *Protests from scientists* ("The tendency was for the scientists to favor publication and for the military and political leaders to oppose it... Under the rules of the International Geophysical Year, the data on Argus collected by the United States satellite, Explorer IV, had to be made public by September. This requirement for publication of complete, tabulated satellite data was steered through last summer's I. G. Y. meeting in Moscow by the United States over Soviet objections. It is inconceivable, these men [those favoring publication] argued, for the United States to flout these requirements"; *Times* of March 19).

4. *Exposure of the hypocritical game the United States is playing.* Baldwin's assertion in his letter that the tests were "of tremendous potential and actual military importance" backs up our charge that the United States was playing politics with the fears and aspirations and safety of the people. Having agreed to suspend tests pending the outcome of the Geneva conference, the administration not only hurried to get in a lot of tests in Nevada but secretly launched the Argus explosions, which "enveloped almost the entire inhab-

ited portion of the globe" with "a thin curtain of radiation".

When the Soviet Union suspended tests in 1958 after it had just completed a series of big explosions, American spokesmen argued that this was a trick on the part of the Soviet Union to make itself look good without losing any military advantage. Six months later, the United States pulled the same trick. Each government charges that the other is seeking to capitalize on world peace sentiment while continuing to pursue its own military advantage in the Cold War. Apparently both are right. Whether he realizes it or not, it is to this kind of political chicanery that Baldwin feels such a "high sense of responsibility".

The actions of the *Times* are a clear violation of the old high standards of fearless, independent journalism. They are part of a general erosion of the original American ideal of a free and informed populace. Even the government appears to have felt that to forbid publication of the Argus story would be an invasion of the degree of freedom that it customarily tolerates. What would William Allen White or James Gordon Bennett or any of the other old-time greats of journalism have said about this self-imposed censorship?

There is a fatal inconsistency in a society which cherishes the idea of a free press but stakes its survival on modern war. Those who follow the false god of military expediency will twist and turn in an attempt to preserve some semblance of a free press, but in a showdown they will be governed, as the *Times* was governed, by military expediency. (See "A Secret Army for NATO", page 5). Realistically, those who fail to face up to this schizophrenia—and its inevitable result—are the ones who are guilty of a fuzzy, well-intentioned but highly dangerous naiveté, and are adding momentum to the rush toward world suicide.

THE EDITORS

#### MORE FOR THEMSELVES

The wage negotiations now going on in the steel industry offer an insight into the inequities of a planless society.

The shrill cry by the corporations of "inflation" is thin camouflage for a policy of milking the public. Steel profits are the highest in history at this point. Since 1939, real steel wages have gone up by half, but productivity has risen by three-quarters. Since the end of World War II, the workers have re-

ceived eleven raises in pay, but the corporations have boosted prices twenty-three times. For every additional dollar they have added to pay checks, the titans of steel have exacted from the public three dollars in higher prices. They can do it because, in open violation of the anti-trust laws, they administer prices.

By every test therefore, the steel workers are entitled to a substantial raise in pay, and for our part we hope they get it. Even more, with two hundred thousand of their brothers made unemployed through automation and technological change, they are entitled to a cut in hours so that some of these jobless can be absorbed back in industry.

But while we endorse the demands of the workers who toil in the great mills, our friendly attitude does not extend to their union leaders. The vistas of Mr. McDonald and his friends are narrow, their outlook only partially social.

The steel workers now earn about three dollars an hour. At the other end of the working-class rainbow, however, the agricultural workers earn only seventy-two cents an hour, and are lucky to get six months' work a year. There are three times as many agricultural workers as there are basic steel workers. But in our planless society the steel unionists, who have a relatively strong organization, will probably get a sizeable wage raise; the unorganized agricultural workers will remain on the brink of starvation. Our society, and sad to say, most of our union leaders, are drunk with the quest of "more" for themselves, rather than the quest for overall industrial justice.

Why not give agricultural workers (and the unorganized millions in office, retail, and service industries) increases of twenty or even forty cents an hour, while confining the boosts for a hundred and twenty dollar a week steel and auto workers to a more modest sum? The steel union has a million members, the agricultural union only four thousand. For some time now the latter group has been trying to get a subsidy of ten thousand dollars a month to help it in its labors, but the Big Unions have not yet come through with even this piddling sum. There have been a few platonic words and a little lobbying for a minimum wage law that might cover agricultural workers, but there is no militancy, no aggressive campaign really to help the workers at the bottom of the ladder.

S. L.

May 12, 1959

Louisville, Ky.

Dear Mr. Muste:

Thank you very much for your letter of May 8, for the enclosure *LIBERATION*.

I don't want to judge the New York *Times*' methods or its actions. My own feeling is that if they knew we were going to have some high-level bomb tests I wouldn't see why they held the story up. I don't agree with you that advance notice would have forced cancellation of the tests because of public opinion. I haven't seen much reaction of public opinion to tests, and I don't feel the public is well enough informed or its opinion has been crystallized to the point where it would exert much pressure.

Sincerely yours,

Mark Ethridge, Publisher  
The Courier-Journal  
The Louisville Times



# A SECRET ARMY FOR NATO:

"A JUDICIOUS ASSASSINATION OR TWO"

"GUILE, DECEPTION, SUBVERSION, AND TREASON"

A favorite pastime of "Free World" patriots is to publicize the bloodthirsty remarks of foreign rivals. The purpose is to justify the fantastic preoccupation with military "defense" that has become a hallmark of our culture. What is not always realized is that the propagandists of opposing countries engage in the same pastime—and that "Free World" leaders furnish them with a constant supply of blood-curdling material with which to intimidate their populations. Nobody else gives as much "aid and comfort to the enemy" in Communist countries as do the militarists of the West.

We are printing here excerpts from an article, "The Secret Army", which is a case in point. It appeared in the General Military Review, a publication which is sponsored by such military notables as Generals Norstadt, Gruenther, Speidel, and Twining. Such texts are practically unknown to the liberal intellectuals, clergymen, and "average Americans" who identify the defense of Western Democracy with the defense of freedom and of humanitarian or religious values. But they are well-known—and often quoted—in Communist countries by those who fear the expansionism of the West and profit from imposing that same fear on their own peoples.

Although we are conditioned not to think about the fact that American generals and politicians think and say these things (and we react in self-righteous indignation when told of similar attitudes on the part of "enemy" politicians and generals), there is another level on which most Americans accept these ugly "facts of life". In politics, as in business, we live by a double standard. We find it psychologically necessary to believe that the purpose of business is service and that the function of the army is to preserve human life. We let the business men speak of "the public welfare" and the generals speak of defending freedom. And we rarely hoot them down. But in the background of our consciousness we know that the business economy operates by the law of

the jungle: "you've got to look out for 'number one'"; "buy cheap, sell dear"; destroy stockpiles of food without regard for the hungry of our own or other countries, so as to keep prices up; claim in the ads whatever you can get away with that sells the product (does anyone really think that Movie Star X prefers Y cigarettes rather than that the manufacturers of Y cigarettes offered her the biggest bribe? Or that filters eliminate the cancer-producing agent that hasn't even been identified yet?). And in the same way, the ethics of "The Secret Army" really comes as no surprise to us. It's just that we don't like to think about these things—or have them said openly.

The fact is that the sentiments of "The Secret Army" are never accepted with pleasure or pride by the majority of persons on any side of any war—cold or hot. Sooner or later, however, the people of every country are conditioned to feel that the people of some rival country (the comments on business ethics above indicate the economic causes of rivalry) revel in such attitudes—and that there is no alternative except to compete on this level.

If the barbaric statements and practices of Communist military and political leaders justify us in counter-measures of similar inhumanity, so semi-official articles like the following (and the corresponding activities of American spies, saboteurs, and agents provocateurs) justify the Communists in whatever barbaric counter-measures they undertake. But if we do not think that the ethics of the State Department and the American Army (of which "The Secret Army" is a sample) justify the I. C. B. M.'s, hydrogen bombs, and hypocritical diplomacy of the Communists, how can we justify the use of identical weapons by the United States? (In the following text, the italicized paragraphs are mine.)

DAVE DELLINGER

## THE SECRET ARMY

THE TWO TRAGIC PERIODS of fighting which highlighted the recent revolt in Hungary have again focussed attention on a type of military operation which in the past has perhaps been too much neglected.

What happened in Hungary was the spontaneous uprising of an oppressed people and, from the purely military point of view, the action demonstrated all the weaknesses inherent in its origin. On the Hungarian side there was no hierarchy of leadership, no chain of command, no overall plan, no coordination of effort, and no logistical support. Had there been a recognized leadership, a previously worked-out plan, and a staff to implement decisions and coordinate operations, there

can be no doubt that the whole rebellion would have had a very different history.

Now the ways in which an established government may be violently overthrown and a new one substituted fall naturally into three categories, which are the revolution, the civil war, and the *coup d'état*. The *coup* is, above all else, the result of careful planning under a competent leadership. It is indeed the most aesthetically satisfying, as well as the most humane, of all military operations, for it achieves the same type of objective as does a war or a revolution without the clumsy necessity of prolonged campaigning.

At least in the recent past too little military thought has been given to the technicalities of the *coup d'état*.

In many ways this neglect would appear to be un-

fortunate, for it is possible that the *coup d'état* will play an increasing role in military calculations in the future. As conventional war becomes more and more costly and uncertain, it becomes less and less satisfactory as the classic "continuation of policy by other means" which Clausewitz believed it to be. Yet only the most optimistic can hope that violent solutions to political problems will therefore be abandoned. It is more probable surely that there will be a search for alternative methods of violence, and of these the *coup* is by all standards the most worthy of consideration.

Nor is there any reason why the free world's interest in this problem should be restricted solely to its defensive aspects. Recently indeed the *coup* has been used almost exclusively by totalitarian powers to extend their control over neighboring states, yet the facts of the case would seem to indicate that dictatorships are inherently more vulnerable to the *coup d'état* than are democracies.

*[In the eyes of the naive citizen, wars break out when the enemy launches an aggressive attack. But for the noted military theorist, von Clausewitz, war is but the continuation by other means of the policies pursued during peacetime—the struggle for economic and political domination. Even the military experts now agree that war is "more and more costly and uncertain", "less and less satisfactory." How could they think otherwise when faced with the danger that another war might wipe out the human race? But rather than abandon the economic and commercial plunder and the grasping for power that leads to war (Cf. Woodrow Wilson's rhetorical question in 1921: "Is there any man, woman, or child . . . who does not know that this was an industrial and commercial war?"), the author is determined to continue the same policy by still other violent means, the coup d'état. In practice, the coup is seen, below, to involve political assassination, extensive falsehood, armed attack, and the employment of "utterly ruthless" terror in "a veritable crescendo of fury". Apart from humanitarian objections, how realistic is it to assume that any country can launch such a coup (or series of attempted coups) without provoking World War III?]*

In military terms the successful *coup d'état* may be divided into three distinct phases, and we may conveniently call these the Preparatory Phase, the Attack Phase, and the Consolidation Phase. It will often be impossible to fix a definite point in time for the termination of this third phase, for there is probably a sense in which this task is never finally completed since one of the continuing commitments of all governments is self-perpetuation.

There can be no doubt that the first, or Preparatory Phase, is by far the most difficult, the most dangerous, and the most uncertain. Certain guides from past experience, however, may be useful. In the first place it is probably safe to say that insurgent leaders should endeavor to ensure that public opinion is inflamed against the government prior to the *coup*. Carefully selected acts should be performed which will provoke an

official reaction, and this reaction should be presented to the public in the worst possible light. There is probably no better way of achieving this aim than by a judicious assassination or two, preferably in those districts which are most apathetic to the insurgent cause.

Security, of course, is of paramount importance. If the existing regime has foreknowledge of the plot, it commonly possesses enough power to crush it utterly. One of the as yet unexplained phenomena of human existence is the consistent readiness of people to obey an established authority, and even that government which, if overthrown, would be execrated by the entire population will normally be able to rally enough support to defeat the insurgents, providing only that it can act in time. Some security system which will ruthlessly eliminate treasonous or unreliable elements is patently necessary and it is as obviously desirable that the government's intelligence service should be penetrated at as high a level as possible. The use of a cell system, at least in the lower echelons of the conspiracy, is almost certainly mandatory, and the employment of a special section to rescue captured members or to eliminate those who are in danger of revealing vital information will generally prove an unpleasant necessity. In this, as in all other operations in a *coup d'état*, casualties must be expected and accepted.

*[No doubt the "unreliable elements" include those who have been victimized by the "Free World's" propaganda and are unable to "adjust" to its actual ethics, as described in this article. Also those whose elementary decency asserts itself at some point and overcomes "the readiness of people to obey an established authority." Military studies have shown that whereas 99% of those conscripted in World War II obeyed the draft summons, more than 75% found themselves psychologically unable to fire their guns in actual combat.\*]*

Liaison between Main and Tactical Headquarters inevitably involves border crossing which, although difficult, is certainly not impossible, as the history of the last ten years in Europe conclusively proves.

*[These crossings are always solemnly denied in the specific, and Russia or East Germany made out to be liars and troublemakers for having claimed that they took place.]*

Obviously it is not possible to establish in advance what the precise military objectives of a *coup d'état* should be. Those personalities who are the heart of the government must, of course, be neutralized, but very careful thought must go into the drawing up of this proscription list. If the *coup* is successful, the rounding up of government supporters can continue well into the Consolidation Phase, so it is therefore only necessary to neutralize in the Attack Phase those whose freedom would actually hinder that phase. The neutralization of government leaders may be achieved in

*\*Men Against Fire, S. L. A. Marshall (William Morrow and Company).*



one of two ways, either by death or by capture. Of these death is generally the easier and the more reliable as it is certainly the more final.

The buildings to be actually occupied will generally be senior government offices, (including the Parliament House, if such an institution exists and is in session), police headquarters, especially those of the secret police, military headquarters unless—as is devoutly to be hoped—these are already on the rebel side, and radio and television stations. A previously prepared program of newscasts and announcements for the broadcasting stations should be drawn up well in advance and the general public from the very inception of the *coup* should be kept informed, not necessarily of what is actually going on, but at least of what the rebels wish them to believe. The object of this, of course, is to influence the public to those courses of action desired by the insurgents, and it is not therefore necessary that the broadcasts correspond to the real situation. If the *coup* goes well, the announcements will be generally accurate; if it goes badly, or if the timetable cannot be kept, the false news can confuse and harm only the government supporters. In any case, in the heat of the action only an insignificant number of individuals will be able to contradict these reports from personal observation.

*[With increasing classification of both political and military information, only an insignificant number of individuals are able to contradict the announcements of the State and Defense Departments—that the Communists shot down an unarmed plane on our side of the border; that the presence of U. S. troops and missile bases, with nuclear weapons, in Western Germany, Lebanon, Puerto Rico, etc. is welcomed by the populace and is necessary for peace; that America's diplomatic representatives are constantly working for disarmament, an end to nuclear-weapons testing, and a relaxation of tension; that the amount of Strontium 90 in our children's milk is nothing to worry about.]*

To governmental secrecy and distortion must be added the collaboration of the public information agencies (press, radio, and television). See Hanson Baldwin's letter to *LIBERATION* page 3: "The responsibility for withholding the information was mine . . . I would do the same thing again . . . Freedom of the press means a great sense of responsibility to the good of the country . . . Every newspaperman worth his salt does at some time or another withhold some information."

The overall aim of the Attack Phase is, by sudden violence, to confuse, bewilder, and throw into disorder the entire portion of the government machinery which might offer effective resistance, and to replace this as soon as possible with a working alternative. Time is the one commodity which the rebels cannot afford to waste. Everything probably depends on the first two hours. Government communication networks must be disabled and government supporters must be completely terrorized from the outset. In this the insurgents should be utterly ruthless. Casualties which would be prohibitive over any extended period are well spent if success

is gained quickly, and while it lasts the *coup* should reach a veritable crescendo of fury.

*[Is this what makes the coup "the most aesthetically satisfying as well as the most humane of all military operations"? The rationalization for military defense of the West is that in contrast to the "idealistic" method of nonviolent defense it is the only effective way of defending civilization against the terroristic practices of totalitarian governments. But here we have come full circle to embracing the methods we originally set out to combat.]*

In cases where the Attack Phase is complicated by the presence of foreign troops who might support the government it is absolutely essential that the nation's armed forces are, from the outset, wholeheartedly on the rebel side. Even when these conditions prevail, however, every endeavor short of hopelessly compromising the strategic position should be made to prevent an engagement between the occupying forces and the patriot army. If by guile or deception, or even better by subversion and treason within the foreign forces, so much as a few hours can be gained, this time will almost always work to the rebel's advantage.

Even after a successful *coup* it is probable that a considerable degree of chaos will prevail for some time. Fortunately, except in those cases where the aim of the *coup* is the establishment of a military dictatorship, two different sets of revolutionaries will normally be involved, for in *coups d'état*, just as in more conventional forms of warfare, it is certainly desirable that there should be a clear-cut distinction between the responsibilities of the politicians and those of the soldiers.

The politicians who have been put in power by the *coup* must strive during the Consolidation Phase to convince the general public that the new government is deserving of effective support. They must also try to convey this same idea to the governments of friendly neighboring states, and indeed to the world at large.

*[It is not necessary, of course, that "the broadcasts correspond to the real situation. The general public should be told only what the politicians "wish them to believe."]*

The military portion of the Consolidation Phase falls naturally into two parts, and the chief decision of the supreme commander is at what time and with what proportion of his forces he should abandon the one and press forward with the other. These two portions of the Consolidation Phase are the Pursuit and the Mobilization. It is, of course, extremely important that all government supporters should be rooted out and disposed of without delay, and it is probably better to err on the side of ferocity in such an operation.

Ideally this is the time for the employment of the supreme commander's operational reserve. The more rapidly these troops can control the avenues of escape, the richer the harvest is likely to be.

CAPTAIN D. J. GOODSPEED, RCA

# AFTER THE BEAT GENERATION:

## *Hipsters Unleashed*

David McReynolds

LIBERALS AND RADICALS, remembering with nostalgia the political movements of their youth, are confused by the present student generation. They ask themselves what has gone wrong with young people—where is that old fire to build a new world, that naive but glorious idealism once so characteristic of students? They are dismayed to find that most young people seem intent only on their own security—and to hell with the hungry, sick and oppressed peoples of the earth. Those youths who do not conform are even harder to understand—for the nonconformists today are the “beat generation”, seemingly composed of delinquents, sexual perverts, drug addicts, and confused writers of bad poetry—a generation of irresponsible, irrational, and incomprehensible nihilists.

As someone sympathetic to the beat generation—and to its most swinging member, the hipster—I believe that the juvenile delinquents, the noisy young poets, and the unkempt crew of jazz hipsters represent a vital force in our society—a force which, if understood, will throw considerable light on the crisis of our times. To understand why many of our most talented and creative young people have “disaffiliated” from society, we must look at the society they have rejected.

The first factor to consider is the Bomb. The advent of nuclear weapons has changed the meaning of two important concepts—“future” and “death”. “Future” has become a tentative concept. It is not a question of whether the future will be good or bad, but whether there will be *any* future. And “death” has assumed a finality it never had before.

Up to the present we have believed that men must die, but that man would live on through his children, through his works of art, through his heroic deeds in battle—*through the survival of the race*. But now the race may not survive, and our individual death becomes a collective and final death. Allen Ginsberg writes of those who sit “listening to the crack of doom on the hydrogen juke-box”; and proceeds, in another poem, to ask Americans “When will you look at yourself through the grave?” Lawrence Ferlinghetti writes about “any stray assinine action by any stray assinine second lieutenant pressing any strange button anywhere far away over an arctic ocean thus illuminating the world once and for all.” Faced by this sudden new “finality”

of death, it is very important to understand what life itself is about, and to experience life as deeply as possible. If we knew we had but one week to live, would there be time for politics? Or would we do those things we had somehow never found time for in our crisis-ridden lives? Would love become important? Would we walk through the park? Would we put a dime in the blind man’s cup?

The second factor is the revolution now occurring in human culture. This is a revolution far more profound than any contemporary political movement. There are rare points in human history where such basic shifts occur. There is no precedent for our present industrial-technological revolution—except other *equally unprecedented* social changes in the past (such as the shift from a nomadic to an agricultural way of life).

This is a revolution that subjects society to constant and shattering changes. There is only one thing about modern society which does not change—and that is the relentless process of change itself. No sooner does the Model T Ford take us out of our homes (revolutionizing our sexual mores in the process) than television brings us back into them (destroying the art of conversation in the process). We have not planned these changes and culturally we are too immature to know how to control them.

There are no stable institutions to which the individual can turn. The son cannot follow his father’s trade even if he wants to, for technology destroys old trades one day and creates new ones the next. Cultural patterns are eroded by a system of mass production and mass communication in which we all become like one another, speaking the same language, wearing the same clothes, reading the same magazines. But instead of creating a sense of community, this only creates a crowd of faceless and anonymous men.

How is a man to know who he is today? By what does he identify himself? Not by a relationship to the soil on which he was born—for we have left the land for the city, where we flit like harried vagrants from one apartment to another. Nor can a person find his identity in the family—for that institution is breaking down. By winning the right to enter the labor market women have found a degree of economic freedom that makes marriage less necessary—our high divorce rate is one



price we pay for technological progress. The sudden equality of the sexes creates tension in both men and women as they realize that their old roles are destroyed but are uncertain what their new ones should be.

This is the society of the mass. We know everyone by his first name—trying to imply a relationship which doesn't exist. Families living in an apartment house are more isolated from their neighbors a few feet away than were families on the American frontier who lived twenty miles apart. The individual is never able to feel that he is an important part of some meaningful whole. Our hearts ache with loneliness, but we don't know how to talk to one another. "Society" is a word from which all content has been drained. Society doesn't mean community—there is no community, only what David Riesman calls "the lonely crowd".

The third factor influencing youth is the loss of values we have experienced. Medieval man had a set of values centering around the Church—a belief in God gave meaning to life. Rationalist philosophy, emerging triumphant from the French Revolution, destroyed the medieval concept of God, but substituted the concept of the inherent rationality and perfectibility of man. We might not go to heaven, but the human race was on its way to utopia. God was dead, but so was the Devil—we didn't need redemption, we just needed education. When education failed to produce the desired miracles, Marxists argued that the problem lay in the "system", that man could still make his own utopia, but that he would need a revolution first.

The liberal hope for utopia died of poison gas in World War I. The revolutionary hope for utopia was shot in the back of the head during the Soviet purge trials. After Dachau and Buchenwald, all that was left of our faith in the ultimate goodness and rationality of man was a bar of soap and some lampshades made of human flesh.

We emerged from World War II without any sense of basic moral values. Words like "freedom" and "peace" became masks for conformity and violence and the death of individual spontaneity. Both the Soviet and the American blocs speak of themselves as defenders of peace and democracy. Yet what student can forget or ignore the realities of dead men and women in the streets of Budapest, or the harried flight of the Dalai Lama? The bright collective banners of Communism can no longer hide its treason against the concept of a society where the individual man would be liberated (not simply where the working class would be liberated, for one never liberates "groups"—if freedom is not experienced by the individual there is no freedom).

And can we make any defense at all of the "free nations of the West"? There is no more ardent or inflexible defender of freedom than the United States—freedom for the people of Russia, of Hungary, of Tibet.

But the concern for freedom is betrayed by the United States in precisely those areas where it has power to make the ideal a reality. In Algeria it supplies the French with NATO arms. In Formosa it overlooks the tyranny of Chiang Kai-Shek over the native population. In Latin America it supported Batista and supplied him with military equipment until he was overthrown. The ultimate expression of America's disregard for any concept of "truth" was contained in those statements of the Administration favoring nuclear tests in order "to

### *Protest of a 17-year-old Poet (excerpt)*

I want to know where nature has gone in this world  
besides museums and national parks.

I want to turn off all the electric lights and heating pads  
and drown myself in the snow.

I want to know  
in my worship of cadillacs  
if the trees ever weep  
as I have wept  
in their absence.

I want to know if a place has been prepared for us  
in forest or ocean or mountain or meadow;  
or if we are doomed to end our days  
in the conversational chambers of beer-smoke.

I want to know if there is a substitute for gin.

I want to know  
why we can kill the Russians  
but not the whooping cranes.

I want to know how to approach this question!  
Why should I sit around  
in social ecstasies  
while there are still clouds in the sky  
which do not give off radioactive spore-prints?!

\* \* \*

I want to know HOW we can live  
the unfeigned life  
of unconcern  
when  
each time we look to the sky  
an angel of death  
may come screaming  
pointed at us  
on her terrible hydrogen horse!

#### HEAR ME!

for if we would escape the deluge  
it is time for us  
to rip the clothes from our bodies  
and cast them upon the waters of hell!

then to go running  
pure and naked  
in the cold white snow  
to the solitary forest  
where we shall cling  
in the weeping night  
to the lonely trees  
and all we have...

CHARLES WILLOUGHBY SMITH

give humanity a Clean Hydrogen Bomb". Youth senses intuitively that a set of relative "values" which not only permits but *demand*s the building of hydrogen bombs and guided missiles is not a set of values at all, but a rationale for insanity.

Young people disaffiliate from society because they see it as phoney—it is not "real" enough to bother changing. I remember how well this alienation was brought home to me as I was talking to a juvenile delinquent who belonged to a gang, stole cars and got drunk on weekends. He was a smart kid from a good family, but he saw society as absolutely phoney—the only way he knew to assert himself against society was to break as many of its rules as he could. At one point he said: "The guys I really can't stand are the 'clubbies' at school—they still believe in the system." The 'clubbies' he was talking about were the members of the leading social clubs on campus. He didn't envy them. They hadn't rejected him—he had rejected them. The tragic fact is that many of our best young people, our potential leaders, have turned to crime as a rebellion against a society they do not understand and do not trust. With a great deal of justification, they believe that anyone who is socially responsible to an irrespon-

### *Crackpot*

The Beat have already been ridiculed to death. And, of course, deservedly so. The critiques against the movement have been, for the most part, highly responsible and quite accurate. And they have come as a Time-Life-Rexroth-Lipton antidote. . . the beatists were doing a serious disservice to any liberal or idealistic movement by allowing themselves to be exploited; for, by having been made into colorful clowns by the slick magazines they have been rendered socially obnoxious and ridiculous . . . the slicks have given the innocent reader the illusion that a real Underground is being given an ear. It isn't. Only a harmless, crackpot, soapbox kind of character is being plugged. They know that these kids aren't going to do or say anything important—and if they did, they are already disqualified by being passed off as freaks. . . The Trendex rating on Beatism would probably show that people are tired of the subject and have gone back to Westerns.

CURTIS ZAHN

### *Prosody*

"Protest" which you insist on retaining as the magazine's hangup, is a concomitant potential (i. e., automatic side effect) of self-realization (i.e., discovery of certain merciful beauties in my own and others' individuality). If you as an anarchist-politicos put the cart of your mental bureaucracy before the horse, as most non-artist-non-human-beings do, and as you propose to do thru your questions, you eliminate any possibility of insight. All I'm trying to do is help avoid multiplication of Corn. . . "When the mode of music changes the walls of the city shake". Plato. DIG PROSODY. That's the key.

ALLEN GINSBERG

sible and dishonest society is being played for a sucker.

But the beat generation is in the process of growth—having rejected society because it lacks real values, the individual finds himself compelled to search out the meaning of life and of reality. This search must, by its very nature, be individual. Without a set of values social action is impossible. This generation is not "silent", nor has it been bludgeoned into conformity—it is simply functioning outside of society altogether.

It is this concern for understanding reality—for experiencing all possible levels of reality—that accounts for the wide use of drugs like marijuana and peyote. Most of the poets and hipsters take these drugs to help unlock the doors of the other levels of reality and experience, not "just for the kicks". (Neither marijuana nor peyote is habit forming; marijuana usually has a mild effect which is different with each individual, while peyote is stronger. Both drugs seem to have the ability to erase the barrier between the conscious and unconscious mind. Neither drug is particularly harmful physically—probably not as dangerous as alcohol—but use of either may result in a psychotic break with reality.)

In his sexual behavior also, the hipster seeks new levels of experience. One writer asked me if I didn't think it was terrible that there is so much homosexuality among the beats. This is nonsense. There is no more exclusively homosexual behavior among the beat generation than there is in "normal" society and perhaps there is less. But there is a lot of bisexual behavior and a greater freedom in having sexual relations. This is not because the hipster is trying to turn life into one long orgy, but because he believes in carrying relationships with people as far and as deep as possible. One of the beatest characters I ever knew was a girl who told me she felt it was terrible to go to bed with someone you didn't like very much. She couldn't understand how people could make such a big thing of sex itself. At the same time she felt that if you liked someone very much you ought to sleep with him or her at least once, because sex helped bring you closer to the person. I don't put this forward as ideal sexual morality, but it is a lot healthier than the sexual morality of many "un-beat" squares, for whom the sexual partner is only a means of gratifying their own physical needs, and not a human being to be loved and respected.

Thus far we have discussed the obvious reasons for the existence of the beat generation. But there is a fourth reason at work which is the real dynamite of the movement. This is the rebellion against rationality—the attempt by the hipster to establish a sense of meaning and of community by accepting the irrational and intuitive aspect of his personality.

And here, if we are to understand the hipster, we must discuss the role of jazz. Jazz is the international



language of the beat generation. Whenever you find the beats, there also you will find jazz. The British Isles are awash with young kids playing in "skiffle" bands (a form of early New Orleans jazz produced on washboards, jugs, kazoos, etc.). Russians tell American tourists that the most popular programs on the "Voice of America" are the jazz programs. Recently in Yugoslavia three thousand five hundred youth waited six hours for a concert by Louis Armstrong.

It is superficial to say that youth has adopted jazz because it is a music of protest. True, jazz music contains an element of protest—particularly early jazz, which grew from Negroes alienated from a white culture. But it is hard to accept this "obvious" explanation as the real one. The real explanation, I think, is that jazz is irrational music. It is music of spontaneity, of improvisation. A good jazz group does not need written music, a rehearsal or even a discussion. Starting with some tune the group knows, and working out from a steady beat, the musicians can create their music on the spot—directly out of themselves.

Jazz appears as something of a mass social movement in a society which fears the unconscious as a seething maelstrom of incest, murder and the death wish; a society terrified that the unconscious may burst forth and overwhelm the "rational" mind. It is natural that a culture based on science and rationality must fear the intuitive, must try to deny and repress it. Rather than accepting the intuitive (i. e., the irrational) as a necessary part of our selves and the source of all our creative impulses, we have tried to cut it off altogether.

This breakthrough of irrationality is not confined to jazz and the hipsters. We find it also in modern art, and in the theater. It is natural to find the beat writers, the jazz musicians and the abstract painters in voluntary association—they share a common affirmation of the intuitive as opposed to the rational. Nor is it surprising that this group has met with such intense hostility from so many quarters. The antagonism is based on the fear which a rational culture has for something it cannot understand and therefore cannot control.

The beat generation, in embracing jazz, is also acting to create its own community. For many hipsters jazz is a kind of religious experience, demanding the participation of the listener. To quote from a letter that I recently received from a young jazz musician: "You grab the fistfulls of notes by the balls, or rather they grab you. You hold on and you stay on top, riding, flying. You know you are alive. You become the notes and the sound. Everything becomes one and your personality ceases to exist as a personality—it becomes what you blow".

This description applies to a jazz audience as well as to the musician. A hip crowd listening to a good jazz group will interrupt with shouts of "Go Man Go—

Go! Go! Go! Go!" and will greet the end of the number with shouts and applause, for it was more than a piece of music being played—it was a group experience shared, a ritual of community in which the individual could lose himself and thus identify with the whole group.

In embracing the intuitional element of man, the beat generation may point toward basic cultural change. Science has reached a dead end—hard as it may try, it cannot give us a set of values. It cannot tell us "why"—only "how". If man is to live in peace with his technology, then I think he will have to make peace with

---

### *Note on the Religious Tendencies*

This religiosity is primarily one of practice and personal experience, rather than theory. The statement commonly heard in some circles, "All religions lead to the same goal" is the result of fantastically sloppy thinking and no practice. It is good to remember that all religions are nine-tenths fraud and are responsible for numerous social evils.

Within the beat generation you find three things going on:

**1. Vision and illumination-seeking.** This is most easily done by systematic experimentation with narcotics. Marijuana is a daily standby and peyote is the real eye-opener. These are sometimes supplemented by dips into yoga technique, alcohol, and Subud. Although a good deal of personal insight can be obtained by the intelligent use of drugs, being high all the time leads nowhere because it lacks intellect, will, and compassion; and a personal drug kick is of no use to anyone else in the world.

**2. Love, respect for life, abandon, Whitman, pacifism, anarchism, etc.** This comes out of various traditions including Quakers, Shinshu Buddhism, Sufism. And from a loving and open heart. At its best this state of mind has led people to actively resist war, start communities, and try to love one another. It is also partly responsible for the mystique of "angels", the glorification of skidroad and hitch-hiking, and a kind of mindless enthusiasm. If it respects life, it fails to respect heartless wisdom and death; and this is a shortcoming.

**3. Discipline, aesthetics, and tradition.** This was going on well before the beat generation got into print. It differs from the "All is one" stance in that its practitioners settle on one traditional religion, try to absorb the feel of its art and history, and carry out whatever asceticism is required. One could become an Aimu bear-dancer or a Yurok shaman as well as a Trappist monk, if he put himself to it. What this bit often lacks is what 2 and 3 have, i.e. real commitment to the stewpot of the world and real insight into the vision-lands of the unconscious.

The unstartling conclusion is that if a person cannot comprehend all three of these aspects—contemplation (and not by use of drugs), morality (which usually means social protest to me), and wisdom—in his beat life, he just won't make it. But even so he may get pretty far out, and that's probably better than moping around classrooms or writing books on Buddhism and Happiness for the masses, as the squares (who will shortly have succeeded in putting us all down) do.

GARY SNYDER

his intuitional self. (This assumption, that a set of values may be based on the intuitional aspect of personality, raises, of course, certain basic questions of a religious nature, including the possibility that "God" is not as dead as we had assumed. It seems possible to me that the beat generation may herald a rebirth of a religious movement—but if so, a religious movement quite unlike any of the major religions in the West, as they are now practiced.)

When people refer to the beat generation and the hipsters as passing fads they could not be more mistaken. The terms will change—they always do—and the slick magazines will move on to find some new interest. But the hipster was there long before *Time* discovered him. And the beat generation, by whatever name it is called, is the natural expression of our times, international in character and deeply rooted in the chaos of our society.

For all his faults, the hipster is a hero of our times because he has rebelled against a society which is only rational *but no longer sane*, a society which, because it has divorced man from his intuitive self, can talk calmly of waging nuclear war. The hipster's ability to act spontaneously in a society which demands conformity is in itself an affirmation of the ability of the human being to will his own actions.

There is a final point to make, concerning those of us who are liberals and radicals. We must understand that many of our best youth will not return to political action until politics assumes an existential value. This is to say that our means must be compatible with our ends. In a world where the human race may die at any moment, the wise man will not sell his soul in hope that his present evil may purchase future good. He will insist that each act have positive meaning in itself.

Our politics must have integrity, which means that it must be based on the one absolute value left in our world—the individual human being as a unique and valuable object that we will not shoot or jail or hate. Let us shape our dogmas to fit the living reality of individual persons instead of trying to shape people to fit the sterile framework of abstract theories. Through direct action on a community level—politics based on people—we must establish that sense of community which is so terribly absent from contemporary life.

I believe in the human race and in its future. I am convinced that the hipster also wants desperately to believe—that the one great weakness of the beat generation is its inability to affirm life. A real affirmation of life means a great deal more than what Gary Snyder calls "a kind of mindless enthusiasm"—it means the joy and the agony of involvement in life itself, as a participant and not merely as an observer. But before the hipster will participate he must see in action an

ideal worth the involvement. It is a Gandhi, not a Stevenson, that the hipster will follow. The only way to give meaning to politics or to life in this troubled and uncertain world is to recognize that, whatever the "future" may hold, politics will have value only if we are committed to act with integrity in the present.

## Poetry and Politics

When Matisse died, Picasso said, "Now there are things which I cannot say to anyone living." And yet—he kept on saying them . . . differently, of course. The secret of saying what cannot be said is one way of telling a Picasso. The trademark of the *avant-garde* artist is not that he shocks us for the *scandale* of it, but that he knows how to express more of tomorrow than others.

We are passing through the age of socialist realism. We are working toward socialist "sur-realism". It is in this sense that one has to understand my slogan: "The goal of life isn't socialism; the goal of socialism is to live."

All that any of us are trying to do is to be honest and speak the truth. That's where the trouble begins in trying to define *avant-garde*. For to be honest is a technical problem that is always changing.

Consider a new little magazine entitled *Hearse*. "A Vehicle used to Convey the Dead . . . carrying poetry, prose, artwork and incidental cadaver to the great Cemetery of the American Intellect." The contents are in keeping with this description from the title page. The next step in poetry is beyond murder—to dissection.

When my friends Ed Dahlberg and Henry Miller published their *Bottom Dogs* and *Black Spring* in Paris in the Thirties people like Huxley and Lawrence wrote: this is the uttermost . . . And yet—there seems to be no limit to the disintegration of the human psyche under contemporary conditions. As long as poems are conceived within the confines of a dying social order, what solution is there but violence or "lunacy poetry—writing whatever comes into your head," as one spokesman for the beat generation defines it?

I am sometimes accused of ambivalence because I pay attention to what the beat generation is doing and respect both their rejection of Madison Avenue values and the formalism of the "Bards of the White Citizens Councils."

I respect the warning that the best poets of the beat generation give us of still greater horrors to come. I, too, believe the maggots of the old order endanger everybody's sanity. But I think many of my young associates in the craft of verse don't hear the cries of the unborn who will not be beaten and disemboweled. The goal is *avant-garde* culture for vanguard politics; then we can have unity of form and content.

Peace has become a geological force; its opposite, geological doom. We have put our hands into the mechanism of the universe and nothing can remain the same.

Peace changes all relationships—human and unhuman—rocks, clouds, sun, people—including the relations between words in poems.

What is *avant-garde* in 1959 is to live under skies we have cleared of poison. Out of this new content of the universe, the *avant-garde* poem will be found putting words and music together differently, in its own way.

And it will, I believe, go up one degree higher than being beat.

WALTER LOWENFELS



# The Social Lie

An Interview With Kenneth Rexroth

Lawrence Lipton

"SINCE ALL SOCIETY is organized in the interest of exploiting classes and since if men knew this they would cease to work and society would fall apart, it has always been necessary, at least since the urban revolutions, for societies to be governed ideologically by a system of fraud."

This is the Social Lie, according to Kenneth Rexroth.

"There is an unending series of sayings which are taught at your mother's knee and in school, and they simply are not true. And all sensible men know this, of course."

Does the rejection of the social lie imply a rejection of the idea of a "social contract"?

"This," says Rexroth, "is the old deliberate confusion between society and the state, culture and civilization and so forth and so on. There was once a man by the name of Oppenheimer who was very popular in anarchist circles. He said the state was going to wither away in a sort of utopia of bureaucrats who serve the state. And you are always being told that your taxes go to provide you with services. This is what they teach in school as social studies. There is nothing contractual about it. There is an organic relationship which has endured from the time that man became a group animal and is as essential a part of his biology as his fingernails. That other thing, the state, is fraudulent. The state does not tax you to provide you with services. The state taxes you to kill you. The services are something which it has kidnapped from you in your organic relations with your fellow man, to justify its police and war-making powers. It provides no services at all. There is no such thing as a social contract. This is just an eighteenth century piece of verbalism."

And what of services like sanitation, water and, in some communities, also public utilities like gas and electricity?

"These are not functions of the state at all. These are normal functions of the community which have been invaded by the state, which are used by the state to mask its own actual activities, like the mask that the burglar wears. Conceivably a burglar could wear a mask of Kim Novak but this doesn't mean he is Kim Novak, he is still a burglar. The state has invaded and taken over the normal community relations of men. Now, it is true that if the state was suddenly to give this up today, people would probably go out and chop down all the trees in the national forests and kill all

the bears in the national parks, catch all the fish in the rivers and so forth and so on. But this is due to six thousand years of exploitation and corruption by the state, not due to anything inherent in the community of man.

In rejecting the social lie, what is the disaffiliate disaffiliating himself from?

"He isn't disaffiliated from society, he is disaffiliated from the social order, from the state and the capitalist system. There is nothing unusual about this. It's just that in America there is an immense myth which is promulgated by the horrors of Madison Avenue and Morningside Heights, by the professors and the advertising men (the two are now practically indistinguishable), that intellectual achievement lies within the social order and that you can be a great poet as an advertising man, a great thinker as professor, and of course this isn't true. There happens to be a peculiar situation in literature due to the fact that literature—and this is true of Russia too—that literature is the thing that sells the ideology. After all, just as the scribe knew in ancient Egypt, writing and handling words is

---

## Mr. Rexroth's Gimmick

**Any statement (including the following) about the beat-bleat-beaten generation tends to dignify it. If LIBERATION has nothing better to do than pay attention to this current pustule on the rump of ignorance then your magazine must also concern itself with every other trivia in America's deathbed. Are you prepared to recognize that every attention you grant this illiterate beatnikism makes it all the more difficult for the talented, responsible, independent writers left in this country? Are you setting aside your professed struggle against war, authoritarianism, fraud, censorship? Any publicity or comfort you give the beatnik monstrosity is contradictory to the human condition you claim to defend.**

In discussing this trivia you will also lend yourself to the unstable meanderings of Mr. Kenneth Rexroth's mind. It is my opinion as well as the opinion of every intelligent person I know that Rexroth aided the invention of a gimmick non-conformity in order to protect himself from deserved oblivion.

Beatnikism is false protest, false rebellion, false radicalism, false non-conformity, false art. It has become the refuge for every scoundrel, every social degenerate, every nihilist.

Beatnikism is not a "social movement" but a bowel movement.

LESLIE WOOLF HEDLEY

the thing that sells the ruling class to the ruled. So departments of English are particularly whorish. On the other hand, a philosopher like Pitirim Sorokin can say at a meeting of a philosophical association, of course we are operating on the assumption that politics attracts only the lowest criminal types—he happened to be speaking of the president of the United States.

"The entire pressure of the social order is always to turn literature into advertising. This is what they shoot people for in Russia, because they are bad advertising men."

What is it, then, that holds the natural community of men together?

"The organic community of men is a community of love. This doesn't mean that it's all a great gang fuck. In fact, it doesn't have anything to do with that at all. It means that what holds a natural society together is an all-pervading Eros which is an extension and reflection, a multiple reflection, of the satisfactions which are eventually traced to the actual lover and beloved. Out of the union of the lover and the loved as the basic unit of society flares this whole community of love.

"Curiously enough, this is Hegelianism, particularly the neo-Hegelians who are the only people who ever envisaged a multiple absolute which was a community of love. It is unfortunate that the Judaeo-Christian wrath of Marx and the Prussianism of Engels has so transformed us that we forget that this is what lay back of the whole notion of the Hegelian absolute. But, irrespective of the metaphysical meanings, this is what makes a primitive society work. The reason that the Zunis all get along together is that they are bound together by rays which are emitted from one lamp and reflected from one lamp to another and these rays are ultimately traced back to their sources in each lamp in the act of the lover and the beloved. So the whole community is a community of lovers. This sounds very romantic but it is actually quite anthropological."

To counter this cohesive social force the state employs the social lie.

"The masters, whether they be priests or kings or capitalists, when they want to exploit you, the first thing they have to do is demoralize you, and they demoralize you very simply by kicking you in the nuts. This is how it's done. Nobody is going to read any advertising copy if he is what the Reichians call orgasmically potent. This is a principle of the advertising copy writer, that he must stir up discontent in the family. Modern American advertising is aimed at the woman, who is, if not always the buyer at least the pesterer, and it is designed to create sexual discontent. Children are affected too—there is a deliberate appeal to them—you see, children have very primitive emotional possibilities which do not normally function except in the nightmares of Freudians. Television is designed to arouse

the most perverse, sadistic, acquisitive drives. I mean, a child's television program is a real vision of hell, and it's only because we are so used to these things that we pass them over. If any of the people who have had visions of hell, like Vergil or Dante or Homer, were to see these things it would scare them into fits.

"But with the adult, the young married couple, which is the object of almost all advertising, the copy is pitched to stir up insatiable sexual discontent. It provides pictures of women who never existed. A guy gets in bed with his wife and she isn't like that and so he is discontented all the time and is therefore fit material for exploitation."

To avoid the pressures of advertising and the slanted propaganda of the State in the "news" pages and on the radio and television, the beat generation rarely buys newspapers or news magazines and rarely tunes in to radio or TV. With very few exceptions, all the young people I interviewed said they never read newspapers at all, glance at *Time* or *Newsweek* now and then, but only at the back of the magazine, passing up all the news, domestic and international. They all own radios but listen only to the jazz programs and an occasional newscast when something interesting is going on like the launching of a space rocket. The few who own television sets use them only to watch the two or three programs a month that offer adult shows, like "Omnibus", or a jazz program. If there are any commercials they are never too lazy or too lost in pot or contemplation to get up and cut out the sound till it's over. I have known them to deliberately pass up merchandise that is advertised in favor of an unadvertised brand, regardless of merit.

To the beat generation advertising is the No. 1 shuck only because it is the most ubiquitous. There are others which are equally if not more important. There is almost universal agreement among them that militarism and war is the biggest shuck of all. As long ago as 1951 *Time* reported that among the younger generation "hardly anyone" wanted to go into the Army and there was "little enthusiasm for the military life . . . no enthusiasm for war." But the draft boards could rest easy, *Time* concluded, for when they are called "youth will serve." By 1956 *Life* was selling military service to the youth as "job opportunities," in line with the official posters—Plan for a Brighter Future, Learn a Trade, etc.—and offering advice on how to "break it up in a number of ways" by serving "as little as six months at one stretch of active duty," by enlisting and getting a choice of duty, etc. For *Time* it was still the Silent Generation, eager to conform and ready to serve.

But the Army knew better. It knew that behind the façade of silence lay a sullen resistance to soldiering and everything connected with it. It was not confined to any disaffiliated minority.

Copyright 1959 by Lawrence Lipton



# NOT SO LONG AGO

A. J. MUSTE

*Autobiography: Part 18*

## Southern Labor Stirs

BROOKWOOD LABOR COLLEGE had been founded by progressive trade unionists, and by educators and liberals sympathetic with the labor movement who worked on the assumption that the movement was capable of a certain amount of self-criticism. It might not welcome criticism enthusiastically; some of its more conservative and powerful leaders certainly would not. But it was hoped that they would tolerate it.

We have seen that as the country entered the Coolidge-Hoover era, the official labor movement, the A. F. of L., was placed on the defensive and its leaders took a more and more conservative stance. They reacted with increasing bitterness and even viciousness against those who were vocal in opposition to this trend, criticism in itself being regarded as evidence of disloyalty. One result of this trend was the A. F. of L. attack on Brookwood, which we described in an earlier installment. We may note in passing that the A. F. of L. was not content to warn its members not to have any commerce with heretics but increasingly insisted on telling them what they should think. This it accomplished by placing control of the Workers Education Bureau of America in the hands of top A. F. of L. officials and by threatening the Bureau with ostracism if its officers resisted the move. Regular conventions of the W. E. B. were then eliminated. None was held for four years. Textbooks on the Workers Bookshelf were subjected to A. F. of L. censorship. The idea that labor might need a "culture" of its own and could not depend on the cultural material provided in the universities was condemned.

Spencer Miller Jr. was the executive secretary of the W. E. B. throughout this period. During his student days at Columbia he had been a protégé of the well known historian, Charles A. Beard. In the beginning he had been suspect among labor bureaucrats, as an intellectual, but he collaborated faithfully with them in all the moves we have outlined. It is just possible that he did this without feeling that he was seriously betraying his early training and some of his educational principles. But these should have led him to attempt a mediating role. Actually, it is on the record that he contributed to the attack on Brookwood and other progressive labor-education projects, reporting to A. F. of L. President William Green that "Mr. Muste" was controlling the flourishing labor-institute program in many places "without seeking W. E. B. co-operation". An objective assessment of the situation might well result in the conclusion that an attempt by Miller to

play a mediating role would have proved futile. But I felt very strongly in those days (as did many others) that Miller paid too high a personal price for the survival of the W. E. B. and the retention of his role in it. Nor have I changed my conviction on this matter.\*

I was in 1928-9 in the position of "having no choice" as to the next move. Brookwood could no longer serve as an educational and inspirational center for progressive unionists, operating within the A. F. of L. structure and accepted, however reluctantly, within it. If Brookwood and the various local educational institutes staffed largely by its graduates was to continue to have a base, we had to help the progressive laborites, who did not choose to acquiesce in the trend, but would not follow Communist leadership, to develop some sort of coherence and structure. The progressive laborites needed Brookwood's help in dealing with the same problem. This was the background for the founding of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action at a convention held in the Presbyterian Labor Temple in New York on May 25-26, 1929. I suppose at the time I would have regarded as laughable a prediction of the circuitous route I was to follow in the intervening years to become in 1937 the director of that same Labor Temple.

The May C. P. L. A. founding convention was preceded by the publication in the February issue of *Labor Age*, then under the editorship of Louis F. Budenz, of a "Challenge to Progressives", written by myself. It had sixteen points and it is worth mentioning the principal ones, both because many of them forecast what the C. I. O. would strive for and achieve in the boisterous organizing campaigns of the Thirties and because others of them foreshadow issues which the A. F. L.-C. I. O. failed to resolve and faces, in an acute form, at this very moment.

The first and major plank was the organization of the unorganized in the basic industries into industrial

\* A useful and well documented study of these developments has just been published by the New York School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University. It is written by James L. Morris, an Assistant Professor at the School, and is entitled *Conflict Within the A. F. of L.* It is of current as well as historical value at this moment when the A. F. of L.-C. I. O. is in a period of defensiveness and of pretty thorough identification with prevailing political policies. Whether in face of the threat of nuclear war and developments such as automation, it will again adopt an attitude of "opposition" and creativeness, is one of the most important questions before the country today.

unions, a job the bureaucrats had neglected both because it was difficult in that reactionary period and because in their hearts they feared what unionization of millions of industrial workers would do to their own jobs and to the structure and philosophy of the labor movement.

Another plank called for an end to the denial of union membership to workers for racial, political, economic, social or religious reasons. Racial discrimination in the unions was a colossal scandal in those days. We opposed expelling Communists merely for being Communists, and denying them the right to run for office. I would not, for a moment, underestimate the problem which the C. P. created in the unions; nor was the C. P. under any illusion that we supported its trade union policies. As a matter of fact, the C. P. L. A. (the "Musteites") were in those years constantly stigmatized in the C. P. press as the worst traitors to the working class, the most dangerous allies of the bourgeoisie and what-have-you. But I am convinced that the C. P. would not have gotten far in this country if it had not been for the general lack of social vision in the labor movement and the practices within the movement of racial and political discrimination.

Another major C. P. L. A. emphasis in those days was on unemployment benefits and other forms of social insurance. One of our most ardent supporters was Abraham Epstein, heroic and tireless pioneer of the movement for social insurance in the U. S., who on this account was regarded as a dangerous radical by the official labor leadership, though he was essentially very moderate in his political orientation.

Along with such proposals, which now seem eminently sensible (and even "old hat"), were others which are still controversial in the labor movement. C. P. L. A. advocated formation of a Labor Party on essentially British L. P. lines. We urged recognition of the Soviet Union by the U. S. government. This is now, of course, an accepted fact, and the labor movement, which had long denounced the proposal as proof of Communist sympathies and "playing into the hands of the Russians", heartily supported the World War II alliance with Joseph Stalin. But this support has not prevented labor leaders today from adopting a nationalistic, rigid, emotionally charged attitude toward problems of Communism and Soviet policy which today causes them to line up in support of a mad nuclear-arms race and the "cold war", with opposition to cultural exchange with Soviet countries.

One other plank in the "Challenge" needs to be mentioned. It advocated a "definitely anti-imperialist" and "anti-militarist" labor movement and one which would become internationalist in spirit and action by encouraging "a closer union of all the workers of the world".

Some trade-union progressives who had supported Brookwood and *Labor Age* did not come along into the C. P. L. A. They had questions about the wisdom of trying to organize what amounted to an opposition within the A. F. of L. They were also confronted with the fact that their own trade-union posts would be placed in jeopardy if they defied the top leadership. Nevertheless, the C. P. L. A.'s labor base was far from negligible. James H. Maurer, president of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, served as vice-chairman, as did Carl Holderman, an official of the Hosiery Workers Union and later for many years head of the C. I. O. in New Jersey. A. J. Kennedy, one of the heads of the Lithographers Union, was treasurer. Members or business agents of the Machinists, Jewelry Workers, Railway Clerks, Hat and Cap Makers, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, Teachers, Sleeping Car Porters, and other unions served on the executive board. Moreover, C. P. L. A. had strong, though unofficial, Socialist Party support, as is evident from the presence of Norman Thomas on the executive board, and even more from that of James Oneal, editor of the *New Leader* and the leading anti-Communist theoretician in the S. P. at that time.

With sharp struggles going on in a number of unions, including one against the autocratic leadership of John L. Lewis in the United Mine Workers, and with sorely exploited workers in textile, steel, mining and other fields spontaneously revolting and crying desperately for sympathy and leadership, it was inevitable that C. P. L. A. activists including myself, other Brookwood faculty members, and our graduates should be drawn more directly into organizing and strike activity than had been the case earlier. This involved taking responsibility for raising relief funds and, more importantly, for strike and union strategy, which would not normally be regarded as functions of a "college", even a labor college. It was perhaps also inevitable that in time this would lead to controversy and conflict in the school. However, I wish to use the remaining space of the present installment to recall an event which took place in the summer immediately following the founding of the C. P. L. A. Not only a number of its own officers, including myself, were involved, but also all the Brookwood faculty members, in one way or another. It was an event which, in spite of the tragedy which was part of it, was an immensely exhilarating instance of collective action and of people of many different backgrounds being fused into a joyous fellowship, as well as of individual heroism and self-sacrifice that lent a noble and even idyllic aspect. I am referring to the Marion, North Carolina, textile strike of 1929.

### Gastonia and Marion

Nineteen twenty-nine was a year when Southern textile workers could no longer endure silently their poverty,



undernourishment, chronic sickness and humiliation.\* One of the resulting strikes was that at Gastonia, North Carolina. The Communist-controlled National Textile Workers Union was involved in that strike and the local police chief, Aserholt, was shot—by whom was never definitely established—in a melee which occurred when he and some of his men were challenged while trying to enter the union grounds at night and without a warrant. Many strikers were living on the grounds, partly in order to be safe from violence at the hands of police and goons. Further notoriety accrued to the Gastonia strike when seven convicted men jumped bail and sought asylum in Russia. One of them, Fred Beal, a C. P. union leader in those days, returned later to serve his time.

Marion, at least the part which tourists saw, was a lovely, slumbering town in the Blue Ridge Mountains. In the other part were a couple of mills and the shacks of the workers who toiled in them—white workers, but certainly regarded by the “better” people as an inferior breed, if not sub-human. Communists had nothing to do with the strike which broke out in the Marion mills that summer. Officially, the A. F. of L. affiliate, the United Textile Workers, was in charge. Extremely cautious, it sought to discourage any strike, not knowing how it could provide relief. A Hosiery Workers organizer, who was a Brookwood graduate, gave what help he could. The C. P. L. A. kept another Brookwood graduate on the job. When the strike came, an emergency relief committee was set up, to which many organizations, such as Y. W. C. A.’s in Southern towns, and renowned individuals, such as Sinclair Lewis, contributed.

The strikers were church folk. If you had been near the grove in which their mass meetings took place, you would have thought that a camp-meeting revival was going on. The union songs were sung to the time of spirituals and evangelistic Gospel hymns. I think it was in Marion that summer that the old spiritual *Jacob’s Ladder* was first adapted to include these lines:

We are building a strong union,  
Workers in the mill.

In these meetings there was a fusion of personal and social religion, the old and the new, which to people like myself was inexpressibly poignant.

Some weeks later, in a private session, not attended by any strikers, a vague agreement was reached with the management of the Baldwin mill which seemed to give

\* An account of the condition and activities of Southern labor in this period, including the story of the Gastonia and Marion strikes, was set down in *When Southern Labor Stirs* by Tom Tippet, at that time director of Brookwood’s extension work, who played a key role in the Marion strike. Later, Tippet was for many years associated with the extensive research and educational program of the International Association of Machinists.

some guarantee that there would be no discrimination against most of the returning workers. It was accepted by the strikers as a pretext for calling off the strike, since they and their friends had come to the end of their resources.

When the workers did go back, most of them were not rehired at all. The ones who were rehired were mercilessly speeded up, amid constant taunts. The result was unrest, and one night the people on the night shift walked out spontaneously. They waited near the mill for the day shift to arrive. In the meantime, the local sheriff and his deputies were in the mill, which suggests that there was a deliberate plan to provoke trouble. They came into the road in the early morning. The mill superintendent came out and called to “loyal workers” to come in to the mill. No one would. The superintendent spoke to the sheriff, who told his men to fire tear gas at the crowd a few feet away. A crippled sixty-five-year-old worker, blinded by gas, grappled with the sheriff, either in anger or fear. The deputies fired at the crowd which was running away from the tear gas. Thirty-six strikers were wounded in the back, twenty-five of them seriously. Two died at once, four later,—all shot in the back. Not a single deputy or mill official was scratched.

### “Violence”

To multitudes the Gastonia strike has the connotation of “violence”. A sheriff was killed, *perhaps* by a striker. In Marion, six workers were shot in the back, running away from tear gas. To multitudes at the time, and probably even now, this did not spell “violence”, in the same way that the killing, perhaps accidental, of one sheriff in Gastonia did.

Besides, Communists were in Gastonia and Communists spell “big trouble”, wherever they go, don’t they? I do not need to be reminded at this late hour that Communists are not Christian pacifists or Gandhians. But may the Marion story remind us that the jungle violence which has often marked American labor history was there independently of the C. P. and that it remained during the Thirties a prevailing accompaniment to labor’s efforts to establish the elementary right to organize, including episodes in which Communists did not figure at all. Those of us who have learned not to trust or condone violence as a means of resisting oppression and achieving social change, must not fall into the trap of having our attention diverted from the violence and the provocations to violence which are perpetrated by those who oppress and seek to prevent change which endangers vested interests.

### October Funeral

On October 4th, a beautiful autumn morning, a funeral service was held for the murdered strikers. Rev. James Myers, then secretary of the industrial depart-

ment of the Federal Council of Churches, had tried to find some parish minister in the Carolina hills or Piedmont cities who would officiate at the funeral. None had been willing. The ministers of the dead in the mill village churches, whose living depended on the mill-owners, did not even dare to attend. So Jim Myers and I conducted the service. Some local strike leaders and an official of the United Textile Workers spoke.

Suddenly in the midst of the services, a venerable bearded figure stepped out of the crowd onto the platform before which lay the bodies of the dead. He was a mountain preacher who had come down out of the hills, like some Amos who retained the prophet's suspicion and scorn of "advancing" civilization and who had refused to accept the "easier" lot of preachers subsidized by mill owners. Without any preliminary talk, he fell on his knees, raised his long arms to heaven, and prayed:

O Lord Jesus Christ, here are men in their coffins, blood of my blood, bone of my bone. I trust, O God, that these friends will go to a place better than this mill village or any other place in Carolina.

O God, we know we are not in high society, but we know Jesus Christ loves us. The poor people have their rights too. For the work we do in this world, is this what we get if we demand our rights? Jesus Christ, your son, O God, was a working man. If He were to pass under these trees today, He would see these cold bodies lying here before us.

O God, mend the broken hearts of these loved ones left behind. Dear God, do feed their children. Drive selfishness and cruelty out of your world. May these weeping wives and little children have a strong arm to lean on. Dear God—what would Jesus do if He were to come to Carolina?

Then the man from the hills walked away, as if in a trance. Some of the bodies were taken elsewhere for burial, but one was buried in the shabby cemetery adjoining the Baldwin mill. Many of us followed his body as it was carried to its grave. As it was lowered into the grave, the undertaker asked if there was a minister present. No minister of the kind he had in mind was there. After a tense silence, I stepped forward. Somebody took down what I said, and some years later showed it to me: "We consecrate this worker's body and give it back to the earth from which it came. He has fought a good fight in a noble cause. He will rest in peace."

What Mr. Baldwin, the owner of the mill in which these men had been sweated and crippled said, when reporters told him about the casualties and fatalities at his sheriff's hands, was this: "I think the officers are damn good marksmen. If I ever organize an army, they can have jobs with me. I read that the death of each soldier in the World War consumed five tons of lead. Here we have less than five pounds and these casualties. A good average I call it."

*To be continued in next issue.*

## LETTERS . . .

G. P. O. Box 463

New York 1, N. Y.

Dear Editors:

June, the month of the execution of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, seems to me a particularly suitable occasion for a request for help in an effort that has had my concentrated attention for close to six years.

I need secretarial and editorial assistance for putting into shape a book-length manuscript that gives extremely important, never disclosed facts about the Rosenberg-Sobell case—facts that can rip that "closed" case wide open. My immediate need is for a typist to type up revised copies of the manuscript and an editor to give it a critical look, the work to be paid for when the book is published or earlier if I can manage it—that is, if I can get the funds.

The manuscript is tentatively titled *The Suppressed Facts in the Rosenberg Case* and it centers on the defense-sponsored sealing of a copy of a secret that according to scientists had never existed and according to the prosecution had long been given away to the Russians. The gist of what the facts convey is that the avowed foes of the Rosenbergs were engaged in a horrible miscarriage of justice while their avowed friends were engaged in the concealment of information that could have changed the climate of opinion on the case—and still can.

How do I come by such facts?

I am one of the "intruders and interlopers"—the quote is Judge Kaufman's—who, over the resistance of the Rosenberg defense attorney and defense committee, forced their way into the case with action that came within a hair's breadth of snatching the Rosenbergs from death. My intrusion began in November 1952 when I published a pamphlet criticizing the conduct of the defense, and it climaxed on the 17th of June 1953, when a petition in my name as "next friend" of the Rosenbergs obtained from Supreme Court Justice Douglas that world-stirring last-minute stay of the execution.

Three world celebrities—Albert Einstein, Lion Feuchtwanger and Lewis Mumford—had read early drafts of the manuscript and gave it high praise in their letters of comment. Einstein thought it "excellent" and said that it had convinced him that "from the viewpoint of restoring sanity to our political climate, one must not let this case rest."

Not least among the implications is the fate of the co-defendant in the Rosenberg trial—Morton Sobell, the young scientist who is serving a 30-year sentence on the flimsiest evidence and the testimony of a self-confessed perjurer who had an axe to grind. My manuscript deals with the Sobell case and is highly critical of the efforts of the Sobell defense committee—many if not most of whose leaders were leading in the Rosenberg "defense." The defense efforts made on Sobell's behalf in the past five years have centered on a legalism that left the public as cold as the courts—the issue of whether the Government used proper or improper means for effecting his arrest. Since Sobell was tried jointly with the Rosenbergs for one and the same conspiracy, an effective attack upon the foundation of the case against the Rosenbergs is bound to undermine the case against Sobell.

With adequate secretarial and editorial assistance my manuscript could be ready for publication in a couple of months. If you are able to help, please write to me at the above address.

Irwin Edelman



# REVIEWS . . .

## Ugly and Not So Innocent

The United States for the first hundred and twenty years of its national existence had a pre-eminent standing as a symbol of freedom among most nations of the world. With the Spanish-American War, our country began to assume the trappings of an imperialist power. Throughout this century, the image of the United States as a symbol of freedom in the minds of the people of the world has faded. In the last twenty years, according to overwhelming evidence, this nation has dissipated most of the good will laboriously acquired over more than a century. In assuming the leadership of the so-called Free World, we also have drawn on our government much of the hatred that used to be harvested by our lesser allies: the British, the French and the Dutch.

*The Ugly American\** is a report, in fictional form, purporting to show why the United States has failed in the post-war period to win friends and influence people in Southeast Asia. There is no reason to reject the assertion of the authors that "the things we write about have, in essence, happened. They have happened not only in Asia, where the story takes place, but throughout the world—in the fifty-nine countries where over two million Americans are stationed." Captain William Lederer is a naval officer familiar with Asia. Eugene Burdick has studied the politics of Southeast Asia.

The book's thesis is that United States foreign policy has failed because the State Department is represented abroad by bores—ambassadors ignorant of the language and the customs of the nations to which they are assigned; timeservers waiting for federal judgeships; newspapermen beloved by *Life* who drive big red convertibles through the poverty-stricken countryside and invite Buddhists and Moslems to parties where liquor is served; drab government girls who live it up abroad with servants, low-priced liquor and partying with other Americans; senators who on inspection tours to see what's being done with billions in U. S. foreign aid talk only to generals and other white men.

But there are "good guys" depicted by the authors too, men who are forever being thwarted by our stupid ambassadors. Here are examples of the authors' good guys:

1. Father John X. Finian, a Jesuit priest, who goes into the jungles to organize Burmese Catholics to fight Communism, manipulates the natives with a bag of psychological tricks, and tries to get ballpoint pens from the American commissary to pay natives to distribute his anti-Communist newspaper.

2. John Colvin, a former O. S. S. agent and Wisconsin businessman, in "Sarkhan" to sell milk powder and organize a milk-distribution center. He is shot by Communists who don't want Colvin to succeed because "the Sarkhanese would believe that America was their savior."

3. Ambassador Gilbert MacWhite, Princeton '34, a professional foreign-service officer with "an enormous knowledge of Marxism and Leninism," who learns the Sarkhanese language in fifteen weeks and plans with the "shrewdness of the businessman, the tactical ingenu-

\* William J. Lederer and Eugene Burdick; 285 pp. \$3.95. New York, W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1958.

ity of a military man and the intelligence and persistence of a diplomat." He discovers that his old and trusted Chinese servants in the embassy are Communist spies.

4. Col. Edwin B. Hillandale, who plays the national anthem of Sarkhan on the harmonica, helps Magsaysay win a Philippine election by teaching the natives that not all Americans are rich and bloated snobs, and has a diploma from the Chungking School of Occult Science. Says Hillandale, with the authors' evident approval: "Every person and every nation has a key that will open their hearts. If you use the right key, you can maneuver any person or any nation any way you want. The key to Sarkhan—and to several other nations in Southeast Asia—is palmistry and astrology." . . . "The Chinese Communist Armies have been mobilizing near the northern border. I knew that if I could once get to the king, I could tell him that the stars ordered that he send the Royal Sarkhanese Army up north for maneuvers. . . It would have been a defeat for the Commies and would have been a great propaganda victory for us throughout Asia." A ranking United States official fouls up Hillandale, arguing that palmistry and astrology are fakes. Ambassador MacWhite says: "Nothing is a fake if people believe in it."

5. Solomon Asch, a union negotiator, is serving at the request of the President as head of the American delegation to a special Armament Section of the Asia Conference. He is trying to induce the Indian delegation to permit the United States to store atomic bombs in India. A member of the United States delegation is sleeping with a Chinese woman physician who is a Communist. The delegate botches up the conference because he is too sleepy to answer a question relating to the safety of thermonuclear weapons in training flights.

6. Emma Atkins, wife of an American businessman, notes that the Sarkhanese women are all bent over, figures out that this is because they use short handles on their brooms, and teaches them to use long handles and straighten up.

In a "factual epilogue," the authors argue that the "horde" of 1,500,000 American amateurs now working for the government abroad should be replaced by "a small force of well-trained, well-chosen, hard-working and dedicated professionals."

The facts presented in *The Ugly American* are sickening. Wholly as sickening, however, are the authors' insipid views of what "good" Americans should be doing abroad, and their failure to understand that what is wrong with our foreign policy is not the people who execute it but the policy itself. Even if our government was represented by persons as intelligent, educated and dedicated as the Soviet representatives are made to appear in this book, our present policy would continue only to repel the peoples of Asia and Africa.

What the authors seem to be asking for are State Department representatives more skillful than the present batch in manipulating the natives in the interests of the United States and anti-Communism. Missing in the book, and apparently in our legations abroad, is any spirit of love and respect for the people of Southeast Asia, any desire to help them attain to democracy and freedom, any pride in this nation's past and belief in the validity of the things for which it once stood.

CHARLES CHADWICK

# American Friends Service Committee

## SUMMER PROGRAMS

*it isn't too late! . . .*

### The AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE

provides "vacations with a purpose" throughout the Summer: Institutes of International Relations for Adults; World Affairs Camps for High School Age; and Family Camps. These are listed according to location, date and age group.

#### ADULT:

California—August 25-29

#### FAMILY:

(all ages)

California—June 28-July 5

Colorado—July 26-August 1

Canada—August 8-16

Minnesota—August 9-15

New York—August 8-22

Ohio—August 16-23

New Hampshire—Aug. 28-Sept. 4

Indiana—Aug. 29-Sept. 5

#### HIGH SCHOOL:

Massachusetts—Aug. 21-27

New York—August 22-29

Colorado—August 23-30

Inquiries should be directed to:

**Community Peace Education**  
American Friends Service Committee  
20 South Twelfth Street  
Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania

## PEACE LITERATURE

*books . . .*

*pamphlets . . .*

*reprints . . .*

### THE WEST IN CRISIS by James P. Warburg

An analysis of the reaction of American foreign policy to a crisis world.

Doubleday and Co., April 1959 \$1.50

### WHAT'S GOING ON IN CHINA?

Four eye-witness accounts of changing conditions in Communist China and their social and international implications.

AFSC, 1959

25c

### PEACE PACKET

A collection of the best articles and reprints published six times a year by the AFSC. An editorial service which helps you invest your valuable reading time to best advantage. A year's subscription costs \$2.50. Sample copies on request.

Order any of these from . . .

**National Peace Literature Service**  
American Friends Service Committee  
20 South Twelfth Street  
Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania

## **Liberation**

110 Christopher Street  
New York 14, N. Y.

Form 3547 Requested

Andover-Harvard Theological  
Library,  
45 Francis Ave.  
Cambridge 38, Mass.

Bulk Rate  
U. S. POSTAGE  
**PAID**  
PERMIT No. 9898  
New York, N. Y.



ee

RE

oreign

ons in  
tional

25c

lished  
service  
time to  
\$2.50.

service  
mittee  
Street  
ylvania

GE

896  
Y.